

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on February 18, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 13, 15-16, 19, and 21 are amended, no claims are canceled, new claim 22 is added; as a result, claims 1-22 are pending in this application.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 13, 15-16, 19, 21, and 22 are supported by the originally filed specification.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15 states the peripheral device of claim 13 "further comprising a third means..." The Examiner asserts, "Since a third means has already been stated in claim 13, it is unclear as to whether this 'third means' is a new means of the device or whether it is a modification of the already mentioned third means. The use of the phrase 'further comprising a third means' makes the scope of claim 15 indefinite."

Applicant has considered the above rejection and has made an appropriate amendment to make the claim allowable. In particular, Applicant noticed that the "third means" referred to in claim 13 is not the same as the third means referred to in claim 15; therefore, changing "a" to "the" would be inappropriate. Instead, a "fourth" was substituted for a "third" in reference to the means of claim 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15.

In addition, in line 3 of claim 15, "the user" was changed to "user" to clarify the language of the claim. Also, because line 2 of claim 19 recites "a user identification," the language "a user identification" in line 3 of claim 19 was changed to "the user identification".

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 12-20 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 5,305,195). Applicant traverses these rejections as follows.

Regarding claims 1 and 13, the Examiner cites column 7, lines 23-31, of the Murphy reference as describing a peripheral device, coupled to a computer communication network, which includes a content delivery device operable to deliver electronic content information. By using the phrase “on-line terminals” in its title, and stating that such terminals are, as recited in column 7, lines 25-28, “actually a convention[al] terminal of the type used in an ATM today with the addition of a video display unit, a logic unit, a decoder and a hard disc of the type used in any PC,” the cited Murphy reference appears to describe a device used for information exchange and display only. Murphy does not describe a software module to receive a request to perform a task from another device coupled to the network, e.g., a print, copy, fax request, etc.

In contrast, Applicant’s independent claims 1 and 13, as amended, recite “software module to receive a request to perform a task from another device coupled to the network”. Further, Applicant’s independent claim 16, as amended, recites “receiving a request to perform a task from another device coupled to the network”.

As such, Murphy does not describe each and every element and limitation as contained in Applicant’s independent claims, as amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 102 rejection of these claims, as well as those claims which depend therefrom.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 5,305,195), as applied above, in view of Cohen, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,094).

Claims 4 and 5 depend from independent claim 1. For the reasons provided above Applicant believes that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the Murphy reference. That is, the Murphy reference not describe a peripheral device that includes a software module to receive a request to perform a task from another device coupled to the network. The Cohen reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Murphy reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection of dependent claims 4 and 5.

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 5,305,195), as applied above, in view of Plasson, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,795,688).

Claims 10 and 11 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1. For the reasons provided above, the Applicant believes that claim 1 is allowable over the Murphy reference. The Plasson reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Murphy reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection of dependent claims 10 and 11.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 5,305,195), as applied above, in view of Official Notice.

Claim 21 depends from independent claim 16. For the reasons provided above Applicant believes that claim 16, as amended, is allowable over the Murphy reference. That is, the Murphy reference not describe a method that includes receiving a request to perform a task from another device coupled to the network. The Official Notice does not cure the deficiencies of the Murphy reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection of dependent claim 21.

Additionally, claim 21 has been amended to articulate that the electronic content information is determined from the task associated with the request. Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references, describe, teach, or suggest each and every element and limitation of claim 21.

New Claims

Claim 22 is intended to capture additional claimable subject matter as supported by the application as originally filed. No new matter is introduced by claim 22. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of new claim 22 upon review of the present response.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, Gregg W. Wisdom, at (360) 212-8052 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 17th day of May, 2005.

Sarah L. Reinhard
Name

Sarah L. Reinhard
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Jay Carstens, et al.

By their Representatives,
BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: [Signature]
Edward J. Brooks III
Reg. No. 40,925

Date: 5/17/2005